



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,492	07/25/2003	Gregg E. Skow	H0003921	4206

89955 7590 11/16/2009

HONEYWELL/IFL

Patent Services

101 Columbia Road

P.O.Box 2245

Morristown, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/16/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com

docketing@ifllaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/627,492	Applicant(s) SKOW, GREGG E.	
	Examiner KIMBERLY LOVEL	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-15,20-28,37 and 42-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-15, 20-28, 37 and 42-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 7 July 2009.
2. Claims 1, 6-15, 20-28, 37 and 42-49 are currently pending. In the Amendment filed 7 July 2009, claims 1, 15, 37 and 49 are currently amended and claims 2-5, 16-19, 29-36 and 38-41 are canceled. This action is Final.
3. The previous prior art rejections of the pending claims are maintained.

Claim Objections

4. The objections to Claims 1, 15, 37 and 49 are withdrawn as necessitated by Applicant's Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 15, 20, 21, 25, 37, 42, 43 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al (hereafter Hartman) in view of US Patent No 5,710,915 to McElhiney (hereafter McElhiney).**

Referring to claim 1, Hartman discloses a program product, comprising:

a) a database that is compatible with multiple end-user systems, the database comprising:

a data section [content databases], each data table including a plurality of data records that each have one or more features that affect its compatibility with one or more of the end-user systems, each data record including a feature field that contains one or more feature bits representative of each of its features [the database server looks up the fields in the correlation table 160 and retrieves the bitmask for the binary attributes] (see column 4, lines 35-46; column 6, lines 19-24; and column 7, lines 39-48); and

a structure section, each feature mask table including data a feature mask record for each of the multiple end-user systems that use one or more of the data tables that include the data records having one or more features [user profile includes information about the client devices] (see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26), each feature mask record including one or more feature mask values that indicate the data records is the one or more features of a data record are compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [binary attribute matching where user profile database can be matched against content profile database], and thereby indicate whether the data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [holding list is a list of matching records] (see column 8, lines 9-18 and lines 54-61); and

b) at least one physical computer-readable medium having said database stored thereon (see Fig 1).

Hartman fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data section and the structure section each comprise of a plurality of tables. McElhiney discloses the partitioning of a data table into a plurality of tables (see column 7, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to partition the data section and the structure sections of Hartman into a plurality of tables as disclosed by McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so to provide parallel access to the tables which accelerates access.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Hartman and McElhiney (hereafter Hartman/McElhiney) discloses the program product of Claim 1, wherein the structure section further comprises a system identification table that includes data that uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems [the user profile and the client profile databases are considered to represent the information that uniquely identifies each end-user system] (Hartman: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26).

Referring to claim 7, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the program product of Claim 6, wherein the system identification table comprises a plurality of system identification records, each system identification record associated with each of the end-user systems [the user profile and the client profile databases are considered to represent the information that uniquely identifies each end-user system] (Hartman: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26).

Referring to claim 11, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the program product of Claim 1, wherein: each data record includes a plurality of fields in addition to the feature field (see column 7, lines 36-38 and column 4, lines 35-46); and the structure section

Art Unit: 2167

further comprises a field definition table that includes at least data representative of each of the data record fields [correlation table 160] (see column 7, lines 39-42).

Referring to claim 15, Hartman discloses a method of generating a database that is compatible with multiple end-user systems, the method comprising the steps of:

generating a data section [content databases] (see Fig 1);

storing a plurality of data records in the data section, each data record including a feature field [record with attributes] (see column 4, lines 35-46);

associating one or more features [attributes] with each data record (see column 4, lines 35-46);

supplying each feature field with one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith [the database server looks up the fields in the correlation table 160 and retrieves the bitmask for the binary attributes] (see column 6, lines 19-24 and column 7, lines 39-48); and

generating a structure section that comprises a plurality of feature mask tables, each feature mask table including a feature mask record for each of the end-user systems that use one or more of the data tables that include the data records having one or more features [user profile includes information about client devices] (see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26); and

including one or more feature mask values, in each feature mask record, that indicate whether the one or more features of a data record are compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [binary attribute matching where user profile database 140 can be matched against the content profile database], to thereby indicate whether

Art Unit: 2167

the data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [holding list is a list of matching records] (see column 8, lines 9-18 and 54-61).

Hartman fails to explicitly disclose dividing the data section into a plurality of data tables that each include a plurality of the data records. McElhiney discloses the partitioning of a data table into a plurality of tables, including the limitation of dividing the data section into a plurality of data tables that each include a plurality of the data records (see column 7, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to partition the data section and the structure sections of Hartman into a plurality of tables as disclosed by McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so to provide parallel access to the tables which accelerates access.

Referring to claim 20, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the method of Claim 15, further comprising: generating a system identification table that includes data that uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems [the user profile and the client profile databases are considered to represent the information that uniquely identifies each end-user system] (Hartman: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26).

Referring to claim 21, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the method of Claim 20, further comprising: including a plurality of system identification records in the system identification table, each system identification record associated with each of the end-user systems [the user profile and the client profile databases are considered to represent the information that uniquely identifies each end-user system] (Hartman: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26).

Referring to claim 25, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the method of Claim 15, further comprising: including a plurality of fields in addition to the feature field (see column 7, lines 36-38 and column 4, lines 35-46); and generating a field definition table that includes at least data representative of each of the data record fields [correlation table 160] (see column 7, lines 39-42).

Referring to claim 37, Hartman discloses a computer system, comprising: a processor; memory in operable communication with the processor; and a database stored in the memory (see Fig 1), the database compatible with multiple end-user systems and including:

a data section [content databases], each data table including a plurality of data records that each have one or more features that affect its compatibility with one or more of the end-user systems, each data record including a feature field that contains one or more feature bits representative of each of its features [the database server looks up the fields in the correlation table 160 and retrieves the bitmask for the binary attributes] (see column 4, lines 35-46; column 6, lines 19-24; and column 7, lines 39-48); and

a structure section, the each feature mask table including a feature mask record for each of the multiple end-user systems that use one or more of the data tables that include the data records having one or more features [user profile includes information about the client devices] (see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26), each feature mask record including one or more feature mask values that indicate whether the one or more features of a data record are compatible with one or more of the end-

Art Unit: 2167

user systems [binary attribute matching where user profile database can be matched against content profile database], and thereby indicate whether the data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [holding list is a list of matching records] (see column 8, lines 9-18 and lines 54-61).

Hartman fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data section and the structure section each comprise of a plurality of tables. McElhiney discloses the partitioning of a data table into a plurality of tables (see column 7, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to partition the data section and the structure sections of Hartman into a plurality of tables as disclosed by McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so to provide parallel access to the tables which accelerates access.

Referring to claim 42, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the system of Claim 37, wherein the structure section further comprises a system identification table that includes data that uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems [the user profile and the client profile databases are considered to represent the information that uniquely identifies each end-user system] (Hartman: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26).

Referring to claim 43, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the system of Claim 42, wherein the system identification table comprises a plurality of system identification records, each system identification record associated with each of the end-user systems [the user profile and the client profile databases are considered to represent the

Art Unit: 2167

information that uniquely identifies each end-user system] (Hartman: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26).

Referring to claim 47, Hartman/McElhiney discloses the database of Claim 37, wherein: each data record includes a plurality of fields in addition to the feature field (see column 7, lines 36-38 and column 4, lines 35-46); and the structure section further comprises a field definition table that includes at least data representative of each of the data record fields [correlation table 160] (see column 7, lines 39-42).

7. Claims 8-10, 12-14, 22-24, 26-28 and 44-48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al in view of US Patent No 5,710,915 to McElhiney as applied to claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 37 and 45 above, and further in view of US Patent No 5,201,046 to Goldberg et al (hereafter Goldberg).

Referring to claims 8, 22 and 44, Hartman/McElhiney fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the structure section further comprises a table pointer table that includes data that uniquely describes at least each of the data tables. Goldberg discloses a relational database system, including the further limitation of the structure section further comprises a table pointer table that includes data that uniquely describes at least each of the data tables (see column 14, lines 31-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the definition table of Goldberg in order to describe the tables of

Art Unit: 2167

Hartman/McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so since definition table are well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art when dealing with database systems.

Referring to claims 9, 23 and 45, the combination of Hartman/McElhiney and Goldberg (hereafter Hartman/McElhiney/Goldberg) discloses the further limitation of the table pointer table comprises a plurality of table pointer records; and at least one table pointer record is associated with each of the data tables (Goldberg: see column 14, lines 31-54).

Referring to claims 10, 24 and 46, Hartman/McElhiney/Goldberg discloses the program product of Claim 9, wherein each table pointer record includes data representative of at least: a location of the associated data table; a number of the data records in the associated table; and a size of each data record in the associated data table (Goldberg: see column 14, lines 31-54).

Referring to claims 12, 26 and 48, Hartman/McElhiney fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the structure section further comprises one or more return type tables, each return type table including data representative of a format of each of the data record fields. Goldberg discloses wherein the structure section further comprises one or more return type tables, each return type table including data representative of a format of each of the data record fields [data type] (see column 6, lines 33-41; column 11, lines 37-59; and column 13, lines 51-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the definition table of Goldberg in order to describe the tables of

Art Unit: 2167

Hartman/McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so since definition table are well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art when dealing with database systems.

Referring to claims 13 and 27, Hartman/McElhiney fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of a header section that includes data representative of indicia that is used to identify the database. Goldberg discloses the further limitation of a header section that includes data representative of indicia that is used to identify the database (see column 6, lines 33-41; column 11, lines 37-59; and column 13, lines 51-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the definition table of Goldberg in order to describe the tables of Hartman/McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so since definition table are well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art when dealing with database systems.

Referring to claims 14 and 28, Hartman/McElhiney/Goldberg discloses the further limitation wherein the header section further includes data representative of a location of the structure section (Goldberg: see column 6, lines 33-41; column 11, lines 37-59; and column 13, lines 51-62).

8. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al in view of US Patent No 5,710,915 to McElhiney in view of US Patent No 6,134,500 to Tang et al (hereafter Tang).

Referring to claim 49, Hartman discloses a computer system, comprising: a database stored in the memory (see Fig 1), the database compatible with multiple end-user systems and including:

a data section [content databases], each data table including a plurality of data records that each have one or more features that affect its compatibility with one or more of the end-user systems, each data record including a feature field that contains one or more feature bits representative of each of its features [the database server looks up the fields in the correlation table 160 and retrieves the bitmask for the binary attributes] (see column 4, lines 35-46; column 6, lines 19-24; and column 7, lines 39-48); and

a structure section, each feature mask table including data a feature mask record for each of the multiple end-user systems that use one or more of the data tables that include the data records having one or more features [user profile includes information about the client devices] (see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26), each feature mask record including one or more feature mask values that indicate whether a particular one of the data records is the one or more features of a data record are compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [binary attribute matching where user profile database can be matched against content profile database], and thereby indicate whether the data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems [holding list is a list of matching records] (see column 8, lines 9-18 and lines 54-61).

Hartman fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data section and the structure section each comprise of a plurality of tables. McElhiney discloses the partitioning of a data table into a plurality of tables (see column 7, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to partition the data section and the structure sections of Hartman into a plurality of tables as disclosed by McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so to provide parallel access to the tables which accelerates access.

Hartman/McElhiney fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the database is a navigation database for a flight management system that creates an aircraft flight plan. Tang discloses a navigation database for a flight management system that creates an aircraft flight plan (see column 4, lines 33-63 and column 7, lines 14-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the navigation database of Tang with the system of Hartman/McElhiney. One would have been motivated to do so since the type of data does not influence the manner in which the system operates.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed in regards to the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. Referring to Applicant's arguments on pages 11-13 of the Remarks, the Applicant states "First of all, Hartman et al does not disclose all that is alleged in the Office Action.

Art Unit: 2167

Specifically, it was noted above the Office action alleges that the content databases of Hartman corresponds to the data section. ... Although Hartman et al discloses looking up fields in the correlation table and retrieving bitmasks for the attributes corresponding to the fields, nowhere does Hartman et al. disclose, in those portions ... data records having one or more features that affect compatibility with the one or more end-user systems or data records that include a feature field that contains one or more feature bits representative of each of its features.

The examiner respectfully disagrees that Hartman fails to disclose a data section wherein each feature mask record includes one or more feature mask values that indicate whether the one or more features of a data record are compatible with the one or more end-user systems, and thereby indicate whether the data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems. Column 6, lines 25-39 states that the user profile database stores and provides information about users and also that the information may include information about the client devices. Column 5, lines 3-14 and 25-33 discloses how a binary attribute can be compared to the profile, Wherein each binary attribute has associated with it a bit mask. Therefore, since the profile information can be device information, the records can be filtered based on compatibility with the device.

11. Therefore, the prior art rejections of the pending claims have been maintained.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

9 November 2009
/KL/